

**REMARKS**

The Office action dated August 7, 2006 has been carefully considered. Further examination and reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-13 are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over new reference Rainwater (U.S. 4,345,266 in view of Belyanski et. al (RU 2165582 C2, previously cited) is respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the prosecution of this application, claim 1 has been amended in order to further distinguish the invention from the cited art. Independent claim 1, now recites the “shaft containing a conductor” and “an antenna horn, being directly connected to said conductor.” These amendments are fully supported by the specification. In view of the fact that nut 82 of Rainwater fixes the position of coaxial feed line 70 so that “nut 82 is tightened against a surface of pedestal 40, teaches away from modifying Rainwater to provide a motor and hollow shaft as taught by Belyankii and suggested in the Office action. The two concepts are incongruent since a rotating motor shaft would have its movement impeded by a locked nut at an end and as such would not make claim 1 obvious when considering Rainwater with Belyanski. Claim 1 has been further patentably distinguished from the cited art in requiring that the antenna horn be “directly connected” to the conductor. Rainwater’s ball 80 provides poor coupling and fails to provide a direct connection from the antenna horn to the conductor. It is submitted that no combination of Rainwater with Belyanski would teach, suggest or make obvious applicant’s invention as now recited in claims 1. Claims 2-10 are dependent from claim 1 and merely recite limitations in addition thereto. These claims are likewise submitted as being patentably distinct from the cited art.

The rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over new reference Rainwater (U.S. 4,345,266 in view of Belyanski et. al (RU 2165582 C2, previously cited) further in view of Studer et al. (U.S. 4,321,572, previously cited) is respectfully traversed. In view of the amendment to claim 1, it is submitted that Studer adds nothing to the combination of Rainwater and Belyanski that would allow any combination of these references to teach,

**PATENT**

suggest or make obvious the invention as now recited in claim 1. Claims 11-13 are dependent from claim 1 and merely recite limitations in addition thereto. These claims are likewise submitted as being patentably distinct from the cited art of Rainwater, Studer, Belyanski or any combination thereof.

In view of the amendment and remarks, this case is submitted as being in a condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 7, 2006

By:   
Richard A. Bachand  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 25,107

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-2779  
Telephone: (858) 845-8503  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502